DISMISSAL OF COMPLAINT

Student's Name:	
Parents' Names:	
Parents' Representative:	Stephen Walker Attorney at Law 212 East State Road 73, Suite 122 Saratoga Springs, UT 84043
Local Education Agency:	Dr. Scott E. Huddleston Superintendent Washington School District 220 Locust Street, P.O. Box 357 Washington, MO 63090-0357
Agency Representatives:	Ernest G. Trakas Attorney at Law 34 N. Meramec, Suite 600 St. Louis, MO 63105
Hearing Date:	October 29, 2007
Date of Decision:	October 29, 2007
Hearing Panel:	Marilyn McClure Patrick O. Boyle, Chairman and Jerry Wright

DISMISSAL OF COMPLAINT

The LEA Motion of October 19, 2007 is sustained.

The Chairperson issued a Scheduling Order herein on October 22, 2007 permitting the Petitioner to submit evidence on allegations raised under 4(b) of their Amended Complaint as follows:

"The school failed to craft an appropriately drafted IEPs for the 2004-2005, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school year [e.g. Present Levels of Educational Performance are absent and the IEPs lack sufficiently measurable Annual Goals and Short Term Objectives]. The types of violations alleged here are similar to those condemned in *Cleveland Heights-University Heights Sch. Dist. V. Boss*, 144 F 3d 391, 398-399 (6th Cir.1998) and *Shapiro v. Paradise Valley Unified Sch. Dist. No. 69*, 317 F. 3d 1072 (9th Cir. 2003). See also *Rowley* at 181-182. The IEP documents themselves are evidence of this and the Parents assert that the key information identified above was absent from each of the IEPs for each of these school years."

Petitioners attorney objected at hearing to the Scheduling Order issued by the Chairperson as lacking proper legal authority. It was stated that the parents would rather have their Compliant dismissed than proceed under the terms of the Scheduling Order.

The LEA's Motion to Dismiss notes that the Amended Complaint fails to allege facts sufficient to enable a response.

Relevant IEPs were submitted by the parents' attorney in response to a Case Management Order of June 6, 2007.

Calendar years 2005 and 2006 are at issue. The relevant IEPs are attached hereto as exhibits:

Exhibit 1, Parents' Exhibit 5 dated 09/22/04;

Exhibit 2, Parents' Exhibit 28 dated 05/18/05;

Exhibit 3, Parents' Exhibit 82 dated 01/25/06; and

Exhibit 4, Parents' Exhibit 139 dated 11/08/06.

The relevant exhibits do show present levels of educational performance and

sufficiently measurable annual goals and short term objectives.

Parents' complaint is dismissed with prejudice for failure to plead facts which

warrant the conclusions sought by parents and for failure of the parents to present

evidence on the issue permitted by the Scheduling Order.

Any party who does not agree with this Dismissal has the right to bring a civil

action with respect to the matter that was the subject of the complaint. The action may be

brought in a State Court of competent jurisdiction or in a district court of the United

States without regard to the amount in dispute. The party bringing the action shall have

45 calendar days from the date of this decision of the hearing officer to file a civil action.

So Ordered:

Patrick O. Boyle,

Chairman of the Three-Member Due Process Panel

755 Rue St. François

Florissant, MO 63031

Phone: (314) 838-4500 Fax: (314) 838-7727

Dated: October 29, 2007

2